

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s) : Mark J. Levine and John VanHandel
Serial No. : 10/631,937
For : FABRICS WITH V-GUIDES
Filed : July 31, 2003
Examiner : Donald J. Loney
Art Unit : 1772
Confirmation No. : 9678

745 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10151

June 23, 2009

REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is a Reply Brief presented in response to the Examiner's Answer dated May 27, 2009. Please charge any additional fees required or otherwise occasioned by this paper or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Albany International Corp., 1373 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204, to which Appellant has assigned all interest in this application by virtue of assignments recorded on March 14, 2004 found at Reel 015101, Frame 0926 of the assignment records of the Patent and Trademark Office.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Upon information and belief, the undersigned attorney does not believe that there is any appeal or interference that will directly affect, be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

The Application was filed with claims 1-23 on July 31, 2003, and assigned Application Serial No. 10/631,937.

The Examiner issued an Office Action on December 17, 2004. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 3 and 18 for informalities. Claims 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9-13 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,302,251 to Schiel (“Schiel”). The Examiner also rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,559,258 to Kiuchi (“Kiuchi”). The Examiner also rejected claims 1-2 and 5-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,559,258 to Nagura et al. (“Nagura”).

In response to the Office Action Appellants submitted an amendment on March 15, 2005, in which claims 3 and 18 were amended to address the objections. The Appellants traversed and argued the rejections.

The Examiner then issued a Final Office Action on June 28, 2005. The Examiner rejected claims 1-21, but objected to claims 22-23 as being dependent on a base claim but otherwise allowable. The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9-13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Schiel. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-16 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kiuchi. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-2 and 5-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Nagura.

A response to the Final Office Action was filed by Appellants on September 21, 2005 traversing the Examiner’s rejections of the claims. The Appellants amended claim 1 and traversed and argued the rejections.

The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on October 11, 2005, maintaining the rejections recited in the Final Office Action.

A Request for Continued Examination was filed by Appellant on October 17, 2005.

The Examiner issued an Office Action on January 3, 2006. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 22-23 as being dependent on a base claim but otherwise allowable. The Examiner rejected claims 1-13 and 16-21 over Nagura under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Examiner rejected claims 1-13 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 3,523,867 to MacBean (“MacBean”) or U.S. Patent No. 5,422,166 to Fleischer (“Fleischer”). The Examiner also rejected claims 14-15 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over MacBean or Fleischer in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,558,926 to Tate (“Tate”). Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,008,801 to Reilly et al. (“Reilly”).

A response to the Office Action was filed by Appellants on April 3, 2006, traversing and arguing the Examiner’s rejections of the claims.

On June 15, 2006 the Examiner issued a Final Office Action maintaining the rejections.

A Notice of Appeal and a Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review and Pre-Appeal Brief was filed by Appellant on August 15, 2006.

A Notice of Panel Decision from the Pre-Appeal Brief Review issued on September 28, 2006 maintaining the rejections of claims 1-21 and allowance claims 22-23.

An Amendment after the Notice of Appeal was filed Appellants on October 30, 2006. The Amendment amended claim 1 and traversed and argued the rejections.

On November 20, 2006 the Examiner issued an Advisory Action maintaining the rejections recited in the Final Office Action.

A Request for Continued Examination and Amendment was filed by Appellant on November 27, 2006. The Amendment amended claim 1 and traversed and argued the rejections.

On February 27, 2007 the Examiner issued an Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-13 and 16-21 over Nagura under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Examiner rejected claims 1-13 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over any of U.S. Patent No. 2,659,958 to Johnson (“Johnson”), U.S. Patent No. 2,718,791 to Hose et al. (“Hose”), MacBean, or Fleischer. The Examiner also rejected claims 14-15 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over MacBean or Fleischer in view of Tate. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Reilly. Claims 22 and 23 were rejected over Nagura in view of GB 2106557 to Curry et al. (“Curry”). Claims 22 and 23 were rejected over MacBean or Fleischer in view of Tate and Curry. Claims 22 and 23 were rejected over Reilly in view of Curry.

A response to the Office Action was filed by Appellants on May 29, 2007 traversing the Examiner’s rejections of the claims. The Appellants amended claims 1 and 15, cancelled claim 14, and traversed and argued the rejections.

On September 7, 2007 the Examiner issued a Final Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner withdrew all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Examiner rejected claims 1-13, 15 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over MacBean or Fleischer in view of Tate. Claims 1-13 and 15-21 remained rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Reilly. The rejection of claims 22 and 23 over Nagura in view of Curry was withdrawn. Claims 22 and 23 remained rejected over MacBean or Fleischer in view of Tate and Curry. Claims 22 and 23 also remained rejected over Reilly in view of Curry.

A Request for Continued Examination and Amendment was filed by Appellant on October 30, 2007. The Amendment cancelled claim 18, amended claims 1, 19-20 and 22 and traversed and argued the rejections.

On January 10, 2008 the Examiner issued an Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner withdrew the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Reilly. Claims 1-13, 15-17 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tate in view of Kiuchi. Claims 1-13 and 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Reilly in view of Kiuchi, and claims 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being over “Tate or Reilly as applied to claims 1-13, 15-17, and 19-21 above” in view of Curry; the Examiner did not cite to Kiuchi.

On April 10, 2008 the Appellants filed a Response traversing and arguing the rejections.

On July 10, 2008 the Examiner issued a Final Office Action (hereafter referred to as “the Final Office Action”) maintaining all the rejections in the previous Office Action. The Examiner corrected the omission of Kiuchi in the rejection of claims 22-23, stating that these claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being over Tate or Reilly in view of Kiuchi as applied to claims 1-13, 15-17, and 19-21 above and further in view of Curry.

A response to the Final Office Action was filed by Appellants on September 10, 2008 traversing and arguing the Examiner’s rejections of the claims.

The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on September 25, 2008 maintaining the rejections recited in the Final Office Action.

Appellants filed a Notice of Appeal and a Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review and Pre-Appeal Brief on October 14, 2008.

A Notice of Panel Decision from the Pre-Appeal Brief Review issued on November 17, 2008 maintaining the rejections of claims 1-13 and 15-23.

On January 12, 2009 Appellants filed an Appeal Brief.

The Examiner's Answer to the Appeal Brief was mailed on May 27, 2009.

Accordingly, the status of the claims may be summarized as follows:

Claims allowed: None

Claims Objected to: None

Claims Rejected: 1-13, 15-17 and 19-23

Claims Appealed: 1-13, 15-17 and 19-23

Claims Withdrawn: None

Claims Canceled: 14 and 18

STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS

Appellants believe that all the submitted Amendments have been entered.

SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The citations to Figures and Specification locations are provided immediately following elements of independent claim 1, which is summarized below. Citations are made to the publication of the present application, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0025935 A1. However, such citations are provided merely as examples and are not intended to limit the interpretation of the claims or to evidence or create any estoppel.

Claim 1 is directed to a fabric (FIG. 1, ref. 10, [0032]) having a fabric caliper (FIG. 2, ref. 22, [0036]) said fabric having a top surface coating (FIG. 2, ref. 16, [0036]) that encapsulates fifty percent or less (FIG. 2, ref. 16, [0036]) of the fabric caliper and comprising one or more guides (FIG. 1, ref. 14, [0032]) attached to machine direction edges of a wear surface (FIG. 2, ref. 26, [0036]) of the fabric so as to encapsulate approximately fifty percent or more of the fabric caliper (FIG. 1, ref. 14, [0035]) with guide material (FIG. 2, ref. 14, [0036]) in a region where the guide is attached to the fabric, wherein the guides are substantially v-shaped (FIG. 3, [0038]).

GROUND FOR REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Whether claims 1-13, 15-17 and 19-21 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tate in view of Kiuchi.

Whether claims 1-13, 15-17 and 19-21 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Reilly in view of Kiuchi.

Whether claims 22-23 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being over Tate or Reilly in view of Kiuchi as applied to claims 1-13, 15-17 and 19-21 and further in view of Curry.

ARGUMENTS

I. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103 SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-13, 15-17 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,558,926 to Tate et al. (“Tate”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,559,258 to Kiuchi (“Kiuchi”). Claims 1-13, 15-17 and 19-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,008,801 to Reilly et al. (“Reilly”) in view of Kiuchi, and claims 22-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tate or Reilly in view of Kiuchi 1-13, 15-17 and 19-21 and further in view of GB 2106557 to Curry et al. (“Curry”). Appellants traverse and respectfully request reversal of the rejections and allowance of the application by this Honorable Board.

a. The Examiner Erred in Rejecting Independent Claim 1, the Sole Independent Claim Under §103(a) over Tate in view of Kiuchi

Independent claim 1 recites:

A fabric having a fabric caliper, **said fabric having a top surface coating that encapsulates fifty percent or less of the fabric caliper and said fabric comprising one or more guides attached to machine direction edges of a wear surface of the fabric so as to encapsulate approximately fifty percent or more of the fabric caliper** with guide material in a region where the guide is attached to the fabric, wherein the guides are substantially v-shaped. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, the claim recites a fabric having a top surface coating that encapsulates fifty percent or less of the fabric caliper and comprising one or more guides attached to machine direction edges of a wear surface of the fabric so as to encapsulate approximately fifty percent or more of the fabric caliper. For the reasons set forth in the Appeal Brief, the cited art does not disclose or render predictable these recitations.

In response to the Appeal Brief, the Examiner largely ignores most of Appellant’s arguments. Claim 1 requires “one or more guides attached to machine direction edges of a wear

surface of the fabric so as to encapsulate approximately **fifty percent or more** of the fabric caliper.” The Appeal Brief shows that Tate unambiguously states that its “bending resistant part...is formed by filling **not less than 85% percent of the space of the fabric** with a thermoset resin....” As Appellant explained in the Appeal Brief, when the fabric structure is filled with the resin layer applied to the face side of the fabric to 85% or more of its thickness, **that only leaves – at best -- 15% of the structure to adequately bond the guide.** See *Tate* at, col. 4, lines 40-51. *Tate*, col. 3, lns. 10-13. At page 6 of the Answer, the Examiner admits this. The Examiner turns to Kiuchi, alleging a:

...teaching that the layers of a material encapsulating a fabric, used to form a belt as does the appellant, on either side thereof can encapsulate 50% of the fabric. The appellant argues that they encapsulate 50% or more of the fabric with guide material in order to improve the guide’s material resistance to tearing off. It would be a predictable result that the more embedded the material in the fabric the stronger the bond would be thereto.

As Kiuchi teaches no guides whatsoever, it fails to cure Tate’s deficiency, regardless of the percentages of penetration of the fabric Kiuchi allegedly discloses. The alleged “predictable result” has no basis in the cited art. The art, to the contrary, teaches away.

Thus the Examiner wholly ignores that Tate’s reason for the 85% on the face side is that: “[t]he amount less than 85% tends not to result in enough bending resistant effect and satisfactory fusion to the guide protrusion.” *Id.*, col. 4, lns. 42-44. Tate unambiguously teaches away from using less than 85% on the face side, and hence, using more than 15% to bond the guide. Moreover, Tate says: “...a guide protrusion is fastened **to the bending resistant part** by fusion. This fusion provides good guiding characteristic **since the fabric is firmly bound.**” *Tate*, col. 4, lns. 21-23, emphasis added. Tate goes on to state:

Polyurethane resin is used in the fabrication of the protrusion body and the trimming edge because the wear resistance is excellent, **the bond formed is good**, and the flexibility is sufficient so that the turning at the inner roll is excellent.

Tate, col. 4, lns. 52-55, emphasis added. Thus *Tate* fails to regard secure attachment of the guide as a problem, and indeed, regards its guide as firmly bound, albeit to the bending resistant part and not the fabric. Taken together with *Tate*'s warning that less than 85% penetration of the face side resin layer does not "result in enough bending resistant effect and satisfactory fusion to the guide protrusion," not only is there no reason for the alleged combination, but *Tate* also teaches away from it.

Appellants also note that *Kiuchi* does not teach what the Examiner alleges. *Kiuchi* says **little** about the percentage of encapsulation or penetration of its coatings, much less in any connection with guides. The Examiner relies on the pictorial representation of *Kiuchi*'s layers 12 and 12' in Figure 2, alleging they are approximately equal to one another. Yet on penetration, *Kiuchi* simply states: "At this time the polyurethane resin is impregnated into the base fabric so that it reaches **approximately the inside**." *Kiuchi*, col. 6, lns 10-12, emphasis added. The Examiner also alleges that Example 2's disclosure of a resin coating of 0.5mm and a doctor coating of 0.5mm teaches "encapsulation in approximately equal amounts." The Examiner misinterprets the reference. *Kiuchi* explains that the whole thickness of the belt, after grinding, is 3.0mm. *Kiuchi*, col. 6, lns 19-26. First, the example still says nothing about the percentage of encapsulation of the fabric caliper on each side, if impregnated as the Examiner posits – which Appellants do not concede. However, *Kiuchi* here only teaches that 0.5mm of coating is applied and cured, and the belt is then ground down to 3.0mm total. Indeed, not only is there no disclosure of the degree of encapsulation, but the disclosure of the grinding down of the 0.5mm

coating indicates that any alleged penetration is necessarily far less than the whole fabric caliper, and the resin thickness is for inner and outer layers.

Nonetheless, Appellants can concede that using coatings to impregnate and thereby build fabrics is known. But Kiuchi's teaching of applying coatings, which has nothing to do with guides, simply cannot overcome the lack of a reason to change the Tate's utterly contrary percentages. Absent the teachings of the Appellants, there is absolutely no logical reason to connect generalized teachings of applying coatings to build fabrics to the claimed encapsulation of guides.

For the reasons amply set forth throughout prosecution, in the Appeal Brief, and above, claim 1 is patentable over Tate and Kiuchi under § 103.

b. The Examiner Erred in Rejecting Independent Claim 1, the Sole Independent Claim Under §103(a) over Reilly in view of Kiuchi

Claims 1-13, 15-17 and 19-21 are rejected under §103(a) over Reilly in view of Kiuchi. At page 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner incorrectly alleges that Reilly teaches the guide being "molded into the interstices of the fabric." As Appellants explained in the Appeal Brief, Reilly discloses a guide formed by molding polyurethane into interstices of a fabric backing, and then the guide, which includes the fabric backing, is subsequently adhered to a conveyor belt. The molding is between the polyurethane and the fabric backing 32 and not between the guides 21 and the conveyor belt 16. *Reilly*, Figs. 1-4. The fabric backing is also part of the guide, which is in turn adhered to the belt using adhesive. *Reilly*, col. 3 lns 39-42, col. 4, lns. 56-59. Reilly's guide is adhered to Reilly's conveyor belt via the guide's fabric backing, thus the guide material is never impregnated into Reilly's belt, hence never encapsulating it. Reilly thus expressly teaches improving adherence of the guide to the belt surface via adhesive (*Reilly*, col. 4, lines 56-59), not encapsulation of the fabric caliper. Therefore, Reilly both fails to

disclose and teaches away from “guides attached...so as to encapsulate approximately fifty percent or more of the fabric caliper with guide material in a region where the guide is attached,” and for at least this reason, the teachings of Reilly cannot and do not combine with Kiuchi to render claim 1 obvious.

In the Answer, the Examiner now argues that claim 1 does not claim a belt, but claims “merely a fabric.” Apparently the Examiner’s position is now that the fabric backing 32 of the guide that is attached to the belt corresponds to the claimed fabric. First, this is inconsistent with the rejection itself, which cites element 18 of Reilly’s figures as the fabric, as stated at page 5 of the action. Element 18 is an internal fabric ply that is part of the belt 16 of 2A, not the guide or the fabric backing therein.

Next, during patent examination, the pending claims must be “given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. The Federal Circuit’s en banc decision in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005) expressly recognized that the USPTO employs the ‘broadest reasonable interpretation’ standard.... The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999).” MPEP §2111.

The specification itself clearly shows that the Examiner’s claim interpretation does not accord with the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. The Summary of the present application states at page 7, lines 21-26: “A further object of the invention is to provide a fabric with guides secured in a manner that overcomes the drawbacks inherent in the sewing, gluing, and fusing methods.”

Moreover, alleging that on the one hand the fabric is the fabric backing 32 for the purposes of encapsulation by the guide material, but on the other hand the fabric is the fabric ply 18 for the fabric with one or more guides and top and bottom surface coatings is not a reasonable interpretation of the claim, even under the broadest reasonable interpretation standard. The claim recites the “fabric having a **top surface** coating...and said fabric comprising one or more guides attached to **machine direction edges of a wear surface of the fabric.**” Even without resorting to the remainder of specification, the claim terms of “a top surface,” “machine direction edges” and “a wear surface” clearly convey that the claimed fabric is for use as an industrial fabric for use on an industrial machine – and not a separate fabric backing that is part of the guide itself that is subsequently adhered to the fabric. Moreover, the claim recites a “top surface coating that encapsulated fifty percent or less of the fabric caliper,” which makes no sense if citing Reilly’s fabric backing 32 as the fabric. An ordinarily skilled artisan would distinguish the guide and its components – including the fabric backing -- from the claimed fabric.

Indeed, Reilly itself defines the fabric backing as part of the guide (see claim 1 of Reilly: “A guide comprising...an elongated fabric backing”). In sharp contrast, claim 1 of the present application recites: “A fabric...comprising one or more guides....with guide material in a region where the guide is attached to the fabric.” Reilly’s guide comprising a fabric backing could not at the same time be a fabric comprising one or more guides.

Nonetheless, even if the Examiner’s interpretation were reasonable, which it is not, the reason given by the Examiner for Reilly’s combination with Kiuchi is adjusting the depth of the coating for a more secure attachment with both coatings. See page 5 of the Answer. The reason does not make sense as Reilly’s guide is adhered to the belt, not impregnated, and the impregnation of the fabric backing is not relevant to Kiuchi’s coated belt – which has no guides

whatsoever. Clearly the only logical combination that the cited references lead to is one where Reilly's guide is adhered to Kiuchi's belt, just as it is in shown Reilly itself, and not the claimed fabric.

For the reasons given in the Appeal Brief and above, and throughout prosecution, Appellants urge that claim 1 is patentable over Reilly and Kiuchi under § 103.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Claims 22-23 were further rejected under §103(a) over Tate or Reilly in view of Kiuchi and further in view of Curry. As for Curry, while the reference is not a basis for rejection of the independent claim, Appellants again note that the mere disclosure of controlling a degree of penetration does not cure Tate's deficiency and teaching away or Kiuchi's (which the Examiner failed to cite) lack of disclosure of percentages or a guide. Moreover, as pointed out in the prior Response, Curry discloses an impermeable shoe press belt that is impregnated over its entire surface with a resin coating. As is well known to those skilled in the art, not only is Curry's belt used only in papermaking, but while in use, it never contacts the paper product, thus always being on the inside of a press fabric, and therefore it **does not** require any V-guides. Appellants submit that this impermeable belt would **not** be able to function in the above-claimed manner.

The dependent claims in this application are each dependent from independent claim 1 discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, claims 1-13 and 15-23 are patentable. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-13 and 15-23 and Appellants request a reversal of these rejections by this Honorable Board. As a result, the allowance of this application should be mandated.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Appellant

By /Brian M. McGuire/
Ronald R. Santucci
Reg. No. 28,988
Brian M. McGuire
Reg. No. 55,445
Ph: (212) 588-0800
Fax: (212) 588-0500

APPENDIX I

CLAIMS ON APPEAL

What is claimed is:

1. (Previously Presented) A fabric having a fabric caliper, said fabric having a top surface coating that encapsulates fifty percent or less of the fabric caliper and said fabric comprising one or more guides attached to machine direction edges of a wear surface of the fabric so as to encapsulate approximately fifty percent or more of the fabric caliper with guide material in a region where the guide is attached to the fabric, wherein the guides are substantially v-shaped.
2. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein said encapsulation is the primary mechanism that attaches the fabric and guide.
3. (Previously Presented) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein the guide is attached to the fabric by melting of the guide, to a sufficient depth, to encapsulate fifty percent or more of the fabric structure.
4. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 3, wherein the melted guide encapsulates the fabric so to create a composite upon solidification.
5. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein a bond strength between the fabric and the guide is equal to the tear strength of either the fabric or the guide material alone.
6. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein the fabric is of a construction taken from the group consisting essentially of woven, or nonwoven, such as spiral-link, MD or CD yarn arrays, knitted, extruded mesh, or material strips which are ultimately spiral wound to form a substrate having a width greater than a width of the strips.
7. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein the fabric is permeable or impermeable.

8. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein the fabric comprises metal, synthetic, or natural filaments, fibers or yarns.
9. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein the guide is one of meltable thermoplastic, extrudable thermoplastic, or a thermoset.
10. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 9, wherein crosslinking of the thermoset is achieved by at least one of room temperature, UV, moisture, or heat.
11. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein the guide is a cross-linkable polymer with sufficient viscosity to maintain its shape during a curing process.
12. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 11, wherein crosslinking is achieved by at least one of room temperature, UV, moisture, or heat.
13. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein the guide is meltable thermoplastic impregnated into the fabric under pressure while using a shaped pulley to maintain guide dimensions.
14. (Cancelled)
15. (Previously Presented) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein the v-guide has one of a flat, hi-ridged and ribbed top.
16. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein said fabric with attached guides is used as a belt in industrial applications.
17. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein said fabric comprises two guides at respective edges of the fabric.
18. (Cancelled)

19. (Previously Presented) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein a coating thickness above a surface plane of the fabric is in the range of 0 to 4 mm.
20. (Previously Presented) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein the coating comprises one of polyurethane, polyvinyl chloride, silicone rubber, and synthetic rubber.
21. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 20, wherein said synthetic rubber is one of nitrile and styrene butadiene rubber.
22. (Previously Presented) A fabric in accordance with claim 1, wherein stuffers are used to control the depth of penetration of the coating.
23. (Original) A fabric in accordance with claim 22, wherein said stuffers are rectangular.

APPENDIX II

EVIDENCE

None

APPENDIX III
RELATED PROCEEDINGS

None